



**MCI Telecommunications  
Corporation**

1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
202 887 2372  
FAX 202 887 3175

**Frank W. Krogh**  
Senior Counsel and Appellate Coordinator  
Federal Law and Public Policy

March 11, 1997

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

EX PARTE

Mr. William F. Caton  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Room 222  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary  
Network Information and Other Customer Information, CC  
Docket No. 96-115, Amendment of the Commission's Rules  
to Establish Competitive Service Safeguards for Local  
Exchange Carrier Provision of Commercial Mobile Radio  
Services, WT Docket No. 96-162

Dear Mr. Caton:

On January 15, 1997, Paul Eskildsen, Steve Inkellis, Len Sawicki and I, representing MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI), met with Dorothy T. Attwood, William A. Kehoe III and Gayle Radley Teicher of the Common Carrier Bureau and Jane Hinkley Halprin of the Wireless Bureau to discuss MCI's positions in the above-captioned proceedings. During that meeting, the Commission staff attendees requested MCI to provide copies of MCI filings in various proceedings. Attached are copies of the following requested filings:

Notice and Plaintiffs' Application for Preliminary Injunction; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support, filed by AT&T Communications of California, et al., AT&T Communications of California, Inc., et al. v. Pacific Bell, et al., No. C96-1691-SBA (N.D. Cal. filed June 4, 1996);

Joint Brief of Appellees AT&T Communications, Inc., MCI Telecommunications Corporation, and Sprint Communications Company LP, AT&T Communications of California, Inc., et al. v. Pacific Bell, et al., No. 96-16476 (9th Cir. filed Oct. 7, 1996);

Plaintiff MCI Telecommunications Corporation's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, MCI Telecommunications Corporation v. Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., et al., No. A96CA-651SS (W.D. Tex. filed Sept. 24, 1996);

Comments and Reply Comments of MCI Telecommunications Corporation, Amendment of the Commission's Rules to

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

022

Letter to William F. Caton  
March 11, 1997  
Page 2

Establish Competitive Service Safeguards for Local Exchange  
Carrier Provision of Commercial Mobile Radio Services, WT  
Docket No. 96-162 (filed Oct. 3 and Oct. 24, 1996).

At the January 15 meeting, the Commission staff also raised certain issues related to the above-captioned proceedings. MCI will be responding to those questions in its comments to be filed pursuant to the Public Notice in CC Docket No. 96-115 released on February 20, 1997.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(a)(3), Note 2, of the Commission's Rules, four copies of this letter and attachments are being submitted. Please include a copy in the public record in both CC Docket No. 96-115 and WT Docket No. 96-162.

Yours truly,

  
Frank W. Krogh

cc: William A. Kehoe III  
Gayle Radley Teicher  
Dorothy T. Attwood  
Jane Hinkley Halprin

COPY

1 McCUTCHEN, DOYLE, BROWN & ENERSEN, LLP  
TERRY J. HOULIHAN (No. 42877)  
2 REBECCA A. LENABURG (No. 111723)  
STEPHANIE SIMONDS LAMARRE (No. 163881)  
3 HARVEY J. ANDERSON (No. 165697)  
LAURA MAZZARELLA (No. 178738)  
4 Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, California 94111-4066  
5 Telephone: (415) 393-2000

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
AT&T Communications of California, Inc.

7 [Additional Counsel on Signature Page]  
8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11

12 AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF  
13 CALIFORNIA, INC., et al.,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 PACIFIC BELL, et al.,

17 Defendants.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

ORIGINAL  
FILED

JUN - 4 1996

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND

**CONSOLIDATED ACTION**

No. C 96-1691-SBA

**NOTICE AND PLAINTIFFS'  
APPLICATION FOR PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION; MEMORANDUM OF  
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
SUPPORT**

Date: July 2, 1996

Time: 2 p.m.

Place: Courtroom 3

Honorable Sandra Brown Armstrong

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2 I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
3 II. STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	2
4 A. The Current, Ongoing Competition For Customers.....	2
5 B. Pacific's Admissions .....	4
6 C. Plaintiffs' Proprietary Information.....	5
7 D. The Economic Value Of Plaintiffs' Proprietary Information .....	7
8 E. Pacific's Misleading and Deceptive Advertisements.....	8
9 III. ARGUMENT .....	9
10 A. The Legal Standard .....	9
11 B. Plaintiffs' Irreparable Harm .....	9
12 1. The Immediate and Irreparable Harm From Pacific's	
13 Admitted Unauthorized Use of Plaintiffs' Proprietary	
Information.....	9
14 a) Wrongful solicitation of customers.....	10
15 b) Plaintiffs' loss of control over their valuable assets.....	12
16 2. The Immediate and Irreparable Injury From Pacific's False	
17 Advertising.....	14
18 C. Plaintiffs Will Prevail On the Merits .....	15
19 1. Pacific Bell Has Already Breached The Billing Agreements .....	15
20 2. Pacific Has Misappropriated Plaintiffs' Proprietary Trade	
Secret Information.....	17
21 a) The Trade Secrets.....	17
22 b) Disclosure Or Use .....	19
23 c) Duty Not To Disclose.....	19
24 3. Pacific Has Violated The Telecommunications Act of 1996.....	20
25 4. Pacific Has Engaged In Unfair Competition Under Federal	
26 And State Laws .....	21
a) Pacific's Advertisements Are False And Misleading.....	21

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(Continued)

1			<b><u>Page</u></b>
2	b)	The Public Is Likely To Be, and Has Been, Deceived By Pacific's False And Misleading Advertisements.....	22
3	c)	Plaintiffs Have Been Injured by Pacific's False Advertising.....	23
4			
5	D.	Balance of Hardships Tips For Plaintiffs .....	23
6	IV.	CONCLUSION .....	25
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

		<u>Page</u>
1		
2	<u>Cases</u>	
3	<i>ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist</i> , 235 Cal. App. 3d 1 (1991) .....	18
4	<i>American Credit Indemnity Co v. Sacks</i> , 213 Cal. App. 3d 622 (1989) .....	10, 18
5	<i>American Home Prods. Corp. v. Johnson &amp; Johnson</i> , 577 F.2d 160 (2d Cir. 1978) .....	21
6	<i>Apple Computer, Inc. v. Formula Int'l, Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 521 (9th Cir. 1984) .....	13, 14, 23
7	<i>Arcamuzi v. Continental Air Lines, Inc.</i> , 819 F.2d 935 (9th Cir. 1987).....	9
8	<i>Big Country Foods, Inc. v. Board of Educ. of the Anchorage School District</i> , 868 F.2d 1085 (9th Cir. 1989) .....	9
9		
10	<i>Boshsei Enterprises Co. v. Porteous Fastener Corp.</i> , 441 F. Supp. 162 (C.D. Cal. 1977).....	22
11	<i>California Intelligence Bureau v. Cunningham</i> , 83 Cal.App.2d 197 (1948).....	10
12	<i>Castrol, Inc. v. Pennzoil Co.</i> , 987 F.2d 939 (3rd Cir. 1993).....	22
13	<i>Committee on Children's Television, Inc. v. General Foods Corp.</i> , 35 Cal. 3d 197 (1983) .....	21, 22
14		
15	<i>Cook, Perkiss &amp; Liehe, Inc. v. Northern Cal. Collection Serv., Inc.</i> , 911 F.2d 242 (9th Cir. 1990).....	21
16	<i>Courtesy Temp. Service, Inc. v. Comacho</i> , 222 Cal. App. 3d 1278 (1990) .....	18, 20
17	<i>Diodes, Inc. v. Franzen</i> , 260 Cal. App. 2d 244 (1968) .....	17
18	<i>Harper House, Inc. v. Thomas Nelson, Inc.</i> , 889 F.2d 197 (9th Cir. 1989).....	14
19	<i>Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal Co. v. Turley</i> , 622 F.2d 1324 (9th Cir. 1980) .....	11
20		
21	<i>Imi-Tech Corp. v. Gagliani</i> , 691 F. Supp. 214 (S.D. Cal. 1986) .....	12, 13
22	<i>Johnson &amp; Johnson v. Carter-Wallace, Inc.</i> , 631 F.2d 186 (2d Cir. 1980) .....	14
23	<i>Lamothe v. Atlantic Recording Corp.</i> , 847 F. 2d 1403 (9th Cir. 1988) .....	22
24	<i>LeSportsac, Inc. v. Kmart Corp.</i> , 754 F.2d 71 (2d Cir. 1985) .....	14
25	<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Gallagher Co.</i> , 1994 WL 715613, *5 (N.D. Cal. 1994) .....	17
26		

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(Continued)

		<b>Page</b>
1	<i>MAI Systems Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc.</i> , 1992 WL 159803, *17 (C.D.	
2	Cal. 1992) <i>aff'd in part</i> , 991 F.2d 511 (9th Cir. 1993), <i>appeal</i>	
3	<i>dismissed</i> 114 S. Ct. 671 (1994) .....	10, 13, 17, 20
4	<i>McNeilab, Inc. v. American Home Prods. Corp.</i> , 501 F. Supp. 517	
5	(S.D.N.Y. 1980) .....	14
6	<i>Oakland Tribune Inc. v. Chronicle Pub. Co.</i> , 762 F.2d 1374 (9th Cir.	
7	1985) .....	23
8	<i>Ojala v. Bohlin</i> , 178 Cal. App. 2d 292 (1960) .....	19
9	<i>Perdue v. Crocker Nat'l Bank</i> , 38 Cal. 3d 913 (1985) .....	22
10	<i>Peripheral Devices Corp., II. v. Ververs</i> , 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11389	
11	(N.D. Ill. 1995) .....	12, 16
12	<i>Power Test Petroleum Distributors v. Calcu Gas</i> , 754 F.2d 91 (2d Cir.	
13	1985) .....	13
14	<i>PPX Enterprises v. Audio Fidelity Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 818 F.2d 266 (2d Cir.	
15	1987) .....	23
16	<i>Princeton Graphics v. NEC Home Electronics</i> , 732 F. Supp. 1258	
17	(S.D.N.Y. 1990) .....	23
18	<i>Processed Plastic Co. v. Warner Communications, Inc.</i> , 675 F.2d 852 (7th	
19	Cir. 1982) .....	13
20	<i>Religious Tech. Center v. Wollersheim</i> , 796 F.2d 1076 (9th Cir. 1986),	
21	<i>cert. denied</i> , 479 U.S. 1103 (1987) .....	18
22	<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989) <i>cert.</i>	
23	<i>denied</i> , 493 US 853 (1989) .....	13
24	<i>Senate of State of California v. Mosbacher</i> , 968 F.2d 974 (9th Cir. 1992) .....	9
25	<i>Stanley v. University of Southern California</i> , 13 F.3d 1313 (9th Cir. 1994) .....	9
26	<i>Trans Pacific Ins. Co. v. Trans-Pacific Ins. Co.</i> , 739 F. Supp. 240 (E.D.	
	Pa. 1990) .....	13, 14, 23
	<i>U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Origin Medsystems, Inc.</i> , 27 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1526	
	(N.D. Cal.), <i>aff'd</i> , 16 F.3d 420 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	12, 13, 20
	<i>U-haul Int'l, Inc. v. Jartran, Inc.</i> , 522 F. Supp. 1238 (D. Ariz. 1981), <i>aff'd</i> ,	
	681 F.2d 1159 (9th Cir. 1982) .....	14, 21, 22
	<i>Valu Engineering, Inc. v. Nolu Plastics, Inc.</i> , 732 F. Supp. 1024 (N.D. Cal.	
	1990) .....	14, 21, 22

(Continued)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26



1 TO DEFENDANTS Pacific Bell, Pacific Telesis Group, Pacific Bell Extras, and  
2 Pacific Bell Communications (collectively referred to as "Pacific"):

3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that at 2 p.m. on July 2, 1996, or as soon thereafter as  
4 the matter may be heard, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of  
5 California, plaintiffs AT&T Communications of California, Inc. ("AT&T"), MCI  
6 Telecommunications Corporation ("MCI"), and Sprint Communications Company L.P.  
7 ("Sprint") (collectively "plaintiffs") will, and hereby do, move the Court for a preliminary  
8 injunction pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 restraining and enjoining you, your  
9 officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and all those in active concert or participation  
10 with you or them from:

11 1. Using any Billing Information for any purpose other than the performance  
12 of billing and collection functions under the billing agreements referenced in plaintiffs'  
13 complaints;

14 2. Disclosing to any person or entity (including without limitation any  
15 affiliated entities or Awards Partners) any Billing Information, except to the extent necessary to  
16 perform billing and collection functions under the billing agreements referenced in plaintiffs'  
17 complaints.

18 This motion will be made on the ground that immediate and irreparable injury will  
19 result to plaintiffs unless the activities described above are enjoined pending trial of this action,  
20 and will be based on the Complaints in this consolidated action, this Notice and Memorandum,  
21 the Declarations of Chris T. Mannella, Judith R. Levine, Dan Arnett, and Laura Mazzearella, other  
22 papers and pleadings on file in this matter, and such other oral and documentary evidence as may  
23 come before the Court upon hearing of this matter.

24

25

26

1     **I.     INTRODUCTION**

2             Plaintiffs, long distance telephone service providers, are owners of enormously  
3     valuable and proprietary billing databases containing competitive information about proven long  
4     distance users. These databases, which Pacific has access to only through contract and only for  
5     restricted purposes that do not include Pacific's marketing efforts, are being exploited by  
6     defendant Pacific Bell on a current and continuous basis. Pacific has introduced a loyalty  
7     marketing program, to compete, right now, with plaintiffs, among others, for local and long  
8     distance customers. Pacific admits that its program depends upon the ongoing use of plaintiffs'  
9     proprietary information; indeed, Pacific claims that without plaintiffs' proprietary information,  
10    Pacific could not offer a competitive loyalty marketing program. Thus, Pacific has simply  
11    misappropriated this invaluable information from plaintiffs' billing databases, developed at  
12    plaintiffs' cost in the millions of dollars, to create a loyalty program that locks in customers now,  
13    so that they will stay with Pacific later. By that time, Pacific admits that plaintiffs' proprietary  
14    information will have been disclosed to Pacific Bell Extras ("PB Extras") and Pacific Bell  
15    Communications ("PB Com"). In this way Pacific obtains and uses, for free, the proprietary  
16    information of its competitors.

17            Pacific's admissions confirm that plaintiffs will succeed on the merits of their claims.  
18    Pacific's admissions also confirm the current and continuous harms which plaintiffs seek to put to an  
19    immediate end. With each day that customers enroll in Pacific's program, plaintiffs lose control  
20    over a little more of their confidential information, and continue to do so as long as a customer  
21    remains in the program and is awarded points based on plaintiffs' long distance information. There  
22    is no amount of money or effort that can make plaintiffs' information confidential again. Further,  
23    Pacific is leveraging its position as a contractual agent, which provides it with access to plaintiffs'  
24    proprietary information in the first place. Pacific gains an unfair competitive advantage against  
25    plaintiffs, which Pacific claims enables it to offer a competitive loyalty program and to obtain,  
26    without paying plaintiffs for it, a list of plaintiffs' most profitable customers.

1 Unless and until enjoined, plaintiffs will continue to suffer irreparable harm.

2 **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

3 **A. The Current, Ongoing Competition For Customers**

4 Plaintiffs and Pacific are telecommunications services providers who are currently  
5 engaged in active competition with each other for both local and long distance customers.  
6 Levine Dec., ¶ 15. Plaintiffs provide long distance phone service, 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶ 41;  
7 Declaration of Dan Arnett in Support of Plaintiffs' Application for Preliminary Injunction  
8 ("Arnett Dec."), ¶ 4, filed concurrently herewith; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶ 4, and intend to provide  
9 local exchange services within the next 6 to 12 months. See Declaration of Judith R. Levine in  
10 Support of Plaintiffs' Application for Preliminary Injunction ("Levine Dec."), ¶ 13, filed  
11 concurrently herewith. Defendant Pacific Bell provides local exchange services. 5/7 Banco  
12 Dec., ¶ 11. PB Com, the new long distance arm of the Pacific family, was created to compete  
13 directly with plaintiffs in the provision of long distance services. 5/7 Bisazza Dec., ¶ 10; Arnett  
14 Dec., ¶ 26. PB Com intends to offer long distance service within the next 6 months, Levine  
15 Dec., ¶ 12, and expects to have one million long distance customers within its first year. 5/7  
16 Bisazza Dec., Ex. 3.

17  
18  
19 <sup>1</sup> In this brief, "5/7 Banco Dec." refers to the Declaration of Bruce Banco in Support of  
20 Application for Temporary Restraining Order, "5/7 Bisazza Dec." refers to the Declaration of  
21 Joseph Bisazza in Support of Application for Temporary Restraining Order, and "5/7 Morrison  
22 Dec." refers to the Declaration of Donna Morrison in Support of Application for Temporary  
23 Restraining Order, all filed with this Court on May 7, 1996. "5/13 Piccirilli Dec." refers to the  
24 Declaration of Gail Piccirilli in Support of Reply Memorandum Re: Application for Temporary  
25 Restraining Order, "5/13 Mosley Dec." refers to the Declaration of Walter Mosley in Support of  
26 Reply Memorandum Re: Application for Temporary Restraining Order and "5/13 Morrison  
Dec." refers to the supplemental Declaration of Donna Morrison, all filed with this Court on  
May 13, 1996. For the Court's convenience, copies of these declarations are attached to the  
Declaration of Laura Mazzearella in Support of Plaintiffs' Application for Preliminary Injunction  
("Mazzearella Dec."), filed concurrently herewith.

1                   In preparation for the imminent provision of directly competing services,  
2 plaintiffs and Pacific have *already begun* competing for long distance and local customers, and  
3 this competition is increasing rapidly. Levine Dec., ¶ 15. Pacific has already made several  
4 promotional public announcements regarding PB Com's services. Levine Dec., ¶ 12. The  
5 carriers all have ongoing loyalty marketing programs designed to retain their current customers  
6 and attract future customers. Levine Dec., ¶ 15; *see also* Declaration of Chris T. Mannella in  
7 Support of Application for Preliminary Injunction ("Mannella Dec."), ¶¶ 4-8, filed concurrently  
8 herewith.

9                   Plaintiffs do not complain about this competition. They do complain, however,  
10 about Pacific's misappropriation and use of information derived from plaintiffs' proprietary  
11 billing databases to obtain an unfair competitive advantage through its loyalty program.  
12 Pacific's new loyalty program, called "Pacific Bell Awards" ("awards program"), awards  
13 customers bonus points if their combined monthly local *and long distance* charges exceed \$50.  
14 5/7 Bisazza Dec., ¶ 5, Arnett Dec., ¶ 21. But Pacific currently cannot provide long distance  
15 services and does not have its own information about customers' long distance usage. Mannella  
16 Dec., ¶ 13. There are several ways Pacific could obtain this information. For example, Pacific  
17 could invest its own resources in collecting the information directly from customers. However,  
18 since customers are unlikely to spend much effort completing surveys, answering telemarketing  
19 questions, or mailing in their old bills, the information gathered by Pacific would be neither  
20 complete nor fully accurate. So Pacific has instead chosen the least expensive and most efficient  
21 way to get long distance usage information: in order to have its "competitive" awards program,  
22 Pacific extracts, for free and in violation of its contractual duties, that essential information from  
23 plaintiffs' proprietary billing databases. 5/13 Piccirilli Dec., ¶¶ 10-13; Mannella Dec., ¶ 13.

24                   Of course, the point of Pacific's loyalty program, which is administered and  
25 promoted by defendant PB Extras, is to provide incentives for customers to stay with Pacific  
26 over time in order to redeem bonus points for awards. Mannella Dec., ¶ 11, 14. This locks in

1 customers *today* so that they will stay with Pacific Bell for local service and switch to PB Com  
2 for long distance service. Mannella Dec., ¶ 11, 14, 18. For example, it would take 17 months of  
3 monthly phone bills totaling \$50 to earn 10,000 bonus points, and some awards require as many  
4 as 150,000 points. Mannella Dec., ¶ 14 and Ex. A. By then, plaintiffs and PB Com will offer  
5 directly competing services. Mannella Dec., ¶ 14.

6 **B. Pacific's Admissions**

7 Under the awards program, each month that a customer spends at least \$50 on his  
8 or her total phone bill, the customer receives 10 bonus points for each dollar spent. 5/7 Bisazza  
9 Dec., ¶ 5 and Exs. 1, 2; Arnett Dec., ¶ 5. Pacific *is currently using*, and intends to continue  
10 using, proprietary information it receives from plaintiffs pursuant to bill rendering and collection  
11 service agreements to calculate these bonus points. Pacific admits that "bonus points are already  
12 being earned," Opp. TRO Brief at 6:11-122, based upon "lump sum" charges, which includes  
13 total monthly long distance charges. Opp. TRO Brief at 2:23-26, 3:1-2. The information about  
14 total monthly long distance charges is extracted from plaintiffs' proprietary databases. 5/13  
15 Piccirilli Dec., ¶ 9, Levine Dec., ¶ 7. But no plaintiff has authorized Pacific to use any element  
16 of its proprietary information, including customer total monthly long distance charges, for the  
17 awards program. 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶ 20; Arnett Dec., ¶ 20.

18 By using plaintiffs' proprietary information to reward customers for both their  
19 local and long distance charges, Pacific obtains an immediate and ongoing competitive benefit.  
20 First, Pacific admits that plaintiffs' information has competitive value to Pacific: it contends that  
21 in order to compete with other customer loyalty programs Pacific must offer rewards based on  
22 total monthly long distance charges. Pacific Bell's Response to Protests Regarding Advice  
23 Letter 18145 at p.7, attached as Exhibit A to the Mazzarella Dec. But Pacific only has access to

---

24  
25 <sup>2</sup> Defendants' Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Application for  
26 Temporary Restraining Order was filed with this Court on or about May 10, 1996.

1 the total monthly long distance charge, an element of plaintiffs' proprietary databases, by virtue  
2 of the Billing Agreements. Instead of paying plaintiffs for the use of their information, or  
3 investing the resources necessary to gather long distance usage information directly from  
4 customers, Pacific has simply taken advantage of its contractual position as plaintiffs' billing  
5 agent to extract plaintiffs' proprietary information -- which is both accurate and complete -- for  
6 Pacific's own benefit, free of charge and all to plaintiffs' detriment, since, as Pacific claims, the  
7 very purpose of its actions is to compete with plaintiffs' loyalty programs.

8           Second, Pacific admits that Pacific Bell intends to disclose "lump sum"  
9 information to the Pacific defendants, including PB Com. Opp. TRO Brief at 3:15-17. By using  
10 plaintiffs' proprietary information as an element of the rewarded "lump sum," Pacific's loyalty  
11 marketing program will provide Pacific, for free, with a list of plaintiffs' most profitable long  
12 distance customers. Mannella Dec., ¶¶ 15-17. This is because, as designed, customers only  
13 qualify for Pacific's awards program if they spend at least \$50 per month on their combined local  
14 and long distance charges, and average local charges per line are only between \$20-25. Mannella  
15 Dec., ¶ 15; 5/7 Bisazza Dec., ¶ 6. Therefore, the average customer must spend at least \$25 a  
16 month in long distance charges to be eligible for the awards program. It is undoubtedly not a  
17 coincidence that customers who spend \$25 per month on long distance are considered heavy  
18 users of long distance and are plaintiffs' most profitable customers. Mannella Dec., ¶ 15.

19           **C. Plaintiffs' Proprietary Information**

20           Plaintiffs each have contracts with Pacific Bell for the provision of bill rendering  
21 and collection services ("Billing Agreements"). 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶ 14; Arnett Dec., ¶¶ 13; 5/7  
22 Morrison Dec., ¶ 14. Through the Billing Agreements, millions of plaintiffs' long distance  
23 customers in California, who are also customers of Pacific Bell, receive a consolidated bill for all  
24 their telecommunications charges, with the charges from each provider included in separate  
25 portions of the bill. 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶¶ 12-13; Arnett Dec., ¶ 13; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶¶ 12-13.

26

1 Plaintiffs pay Pacific Bell a substantial amount each month to perform these bill rendering and  
2 collection services.<sup>3</sup> 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶ 17; Arnett Dec., ¶ 16; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶ 17.

3 In order for Pacific Bell to perform its contractual services, plaintiffs electronically  
4 transmit usage and billing information for their millions of customers to Pacific Bell each processing  
5 day. 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶ 15; Arnett Dec., ¶ 15; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶ 15. All the files, records, and  
6 data elements plaintiffs send to Pacific Bell are coded in a proprietary format. *Id.* The information  
7 transmitted, as well as the format itself, is highly confidential. 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶ 18; Arnett Dec.,  
8 ¶ 18; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶ 18.

9 The Billing Agreements forbid the use of proprietary information for any purpose  
10 other than those stated in the contract without plaintiffs' prior written authorization. 5/7 Banco  
11 Dec., ¶ 19 and Ex. 1; Arnett Dec., ¶ 19; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶ 19. The contract purposes are  
12 limited to billing and collection services. *Id.* The Billing Agreements also limit the disclosure of  
13 plaintiffs' proprietary information within and without Pacific Bell to those individuals who need  
14 the information in order to perform the *contractual* obligations. *Id.*

15 No plaintiff has authorized the use or disclosure of its proprietary information --  
16 or any element of it -- for any purpose other than those specified in the Billing Agreements. 5/7  
17 Banco Dec., ¶ 20; Arnett Dec., ¶ 20; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶ 20. Plaintiffs seek to enjoin Pacific  
18 from any further use and disclosure of their proprietary information because they cannot provide  
19 uninterrupted billing services to each and every of their millions of customers without incurring  
20 substantial costs<sup>4</sup>. 5/7 Bisazza Dec., ¶ 16(d).

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 <sup>3</sup> The Billing Agreements also require Pacific Bell to purchase plaintiffs' accounts  
23 receivable -- for which plaintiffs bear all the financial risk -- in order to perform its collection  
services under the contracts. *See e.g.*, 5/13 Mosley Dec., ¶¶ 3-4; 5/13 Morrison Dec., ¶ 4.

24 <sup>4</sup> Plaintiff AT&T has recently taken back the billing for some of its customers. However, it  
25 has thus far taken back under twenty percent of its California customers, and millions of its  
26 customers continue to be billed through Pacific.

1           **D.     The Economic Value Of Plaintiffs' Proprietary Information**

2           Plaintiffs have invested substantial resources in compiling and formatting the  
3     billing information transmitted to Pacific Bell pursuant to the contracts. 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶¶ 5-7;  
4     Arnett Dec., ¶¶ 5-7; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶ 5-7. They have devoted hundreds of millions of dollars  
5     in capturing, processing, and organizing usage and billing information on a customer account  
6     basis, and continue to spend considerable resources, in terms of both time and money, to perform  
7     these functions, all of which makes the resulting information valuable. *Id.* Their proprietary  
8     billing data is not available to the public, and plaintiffs go to great lengths to ensure the  
9     information remains confidential. 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶¶ 9-10, 18-19; Arnett Dec., ¶¶ 9-10, 18-19;  
10    5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶¶ 9-10, 18-19. Plaintiffs restrict the use of this information within their  
11    own organizations and by contractual agents such as Pacific Bell, and access to the information is  
12    permitted only on a need-to-know basis. *Id.* Plaintiffs' proprietary information is extremely  
13    valuable competitive information because it represents a detailed profile of plaintiffs' long  
14    distance businesses and their markets, products, pricing, revenues, network usage, and  
15    customers. 5/7 Banco Dec., ¶¶ 7-8; Arnett Dec., ¶¶ 7-8; 5/7 Morrison Dec., ¶¶ 7-8.

16           One element of plaintiffs' proprietary information, which Pacific would not have  
17    access to absent the Billing Agreements, is customer total monthly long distance charges. A  
18    customer's total monthly long distance charge is itself very valuable information; it reflects that  
19    customer's long distance usage, which is the single best predictor of future usage. 5/13 Piccirilli  
20    Dec., ¶ 9; Levine Dec., ¶ 11. The heaviest users of long distance services are the most profitable  
21    customers to acquire. 5/13 Piccirilli Dec., ¶ 4; Levine Dec., ¶ 11.

22           In acquiring new customers themselves, plaintiffs do not have access to actual  
23    long distance spending. 5/13 Piccirilli Dec., ¶ 5; Levine Dec., ¶ 8. Plaintiffs therefore invest  
24    significant resources, in the millions of dollars, purchasing customer lists from third parties,  
25    applying sophisticated modeling criteria to select a subset of target prospects who are likely to be  
26    heavy users of long distance services, and marketing to the target list. 5/13 Piccirilli Dec., ¶¶ 5,



1 7; Levine Dec., ¶ 4, 8. The models accurately predict heavy users of long distance services only  
2 60-65% of the time. 5/13 Piccirilli Dec., ¶ 6; *see also* Levine Dec., ¶ 8. If plaintiffs had access  
3 to actual long distance usage information, they could achieve a near perfect accuracy rate, and  
4 could market their services directly to the prospective customers who are in fact heavy users of  
5 long distance, thereby reducing the considerable sums plaintiffs spend on marketing to the target  
6 list. 5/13 Piccirilli Dec., ¶¶ 6-7; Levine Dec., ¶¶ 8, 11. By simply taking plaintiffs'  
7 information, Pacific saves all this expense and effort.

8 **E. Pacific's Misleading and Deceptive Advertisements**

9 Pacific has sought to induce consumers to enroll in its program through an  
10 extensive advertising and promotional campaign including television ads, direct mail, and print  
11 ads. 5/7 Bisazza Dec., ¶¶ 5, 7-8; Arnett Dec., ¶ 21. Pacific's advertisements imply that the long  
12 distance carriers endorse Pacific's "awards program" by emphasizing the applicability of the  
13 program to *all* telephone charges, including long distance. Plaintiffs are not "award partners,"  
14 sponsors, or affiliated with Pacific's "awards program" in any manner. 5/7 Bisazza Dec.,  
15 ¶¶ 11(a), 16(c); Arnett Dec., ¶ 27.

16 Pacific's advertisements also contain misleading and inconsistent "releases." *See*  
17 5/7 Bisazza Dec., Exs. 1 & 2. As described above, Pacific has no right to use, or to advertise that  
18 it will use plaintiffs' proprietary information, including total monthly long distance charges, for  
19 its own marketing purposes. Yet, to enable it to calculate points based on long distance charges,  
20 Pacific has presented customers with a purported "release" of plaintiffs' proprietary data. 5/7  
21 Bisazza Dec., ¶¶ 11-12; Arnett Dec., ¶¶ 26-28. The "release," coupled with the fact that the  
22 advertisements specifically state that awards are based on total charges, including long distance  
23 charges, falsely suggest that a customer may authorize Pacific Bell to disclose plaintiffs'  
24 proprietary information. *Id.* Customers have no right to authorize Pacific Bell to release  
25 plaintiffs' information. 5/7 Bisazza Dec., ¶ 11(b); Arnett Dec., ¶ 27.

26

1     **III.     ARGUMENT**

2             **A.     The Legal Standard**

3             The Court may issue a preliminary injunction when the moving party  
4 demonstrates either (1) a combination of probable success on the merits and the possibility of  
5 irreparable harm or (2) the existence of serious questions going to the merits and the balance of  
6 hardships tips sharply in its favor and a fair chance of success on the merits. *Senate of State of*  
7 *California v. Mosbacher*, 968 F.2d 974, 977 (9th Cir. 1992); *Arcamuzi v. Continental Air Lines,*  
8 *Inc.*, 819 F.2d 935, 937 (9th Cir. 1987). "These formulations are not different tests but represent  
9 two points on a sliding scale in which the degree of irreparable harm increases as the probability  
10 of success on the merits decreases." *Big Country Foods, Inc. v. Board of Educ. of the Anchorage*  
11 *School District*, 868 F.2d 1085, 1088 (9th Cir. 1989).

12             Under the traditional test for whether a preliminary injunction should issue, the  
13 moving party must show: "(1) a fair chance of success on the merits; (2) the possibility of  
14 irreparable injury; (3) a balance of hardships in its favor; and (4) the public interest favors  
15 granting the motion. *Stanley v. University of Southern California*, 13 F.3d 1313, 1319 (9th Cir.  
16 1994).

17             Plaintiffs meet the requirements of all these tests. This Court should grant  
18 plaintiffs preliminary injunctive relief.

19             **B.     Plaintiffs' Irreparable Harm**

20                     **1.     The Immediate and Irreparable Harm From Pacific's**  
21                     **Admitted Unauthorized Use of Plaintiffs' Proprietary**  
22                     **Information**

23             Plaintiffs have already been harmed by Pacific's unauthorized use and disclosure  
24 of their proprietary information, and that harm increases daily. As discussed below, with each  
25 day that plaintiffs' customers enroll in Pacific's awards program, Pacific further wrongfully  
26 appropriates plaintiffs' information about these customers for its own purposes and benefit. In  
doing so, Pacific deprives plaintiffs of control over valuable corporate assets and destroys the

1 value of those assets to plaintiffs. This harm is continuous and irreversible: Pacific must be  
2 immediately enjoined from its continuing use of plaintiffs' proprietary information. *See MAI*  
3 *Systems Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc.*, 1992 WL 159803, \*17 (C.D. Cal. 1992) *aff'd in part*, 991  
4 F.2d 511 (9th Cir. 1993), *appeal dismissed* 114 S. Ct. 671 (1994).

5 **a) Wrongful solicitation of customers**

6 As an initial matter, Pacific is currently using plaintiffs' trade secrets (see Section  
7 III.C.2., below) to *solicit* customers. The loyalty program is, of course, designed to encourage  
8 loyalty to *Pacific*. The program lines up and locks in customers *now* -- customers who will  
9 remain with Pacific when competition in the local exchange market begins and will switch to  
10 Pacific for long distance when PB Com is ready to provide that service. Section II.B.; Mannella  
11 Dec., ¶¶ 11, 14. Pacific's very solicitation creates irreparable harm. *MAI Systems Corp. v. Peak*  
12 *Computer, Inc.*, 1992 WL 159803, \*17 (C.D. Cal. 1992), *aff'd*, 991 F.2d 511, 523 (9th Cir. 1993)  
13 ("As each day passes, MAI continues to be irreparably injured by Defendants' continuous use of  
14 MAI's trade secrets to expand their business and solicit MAI customers"); *American Credit*  
15 *Indemnity Co v. Sacks*, 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 637 (1989) (money damages inadequate because  
16 defendant was soliciting plaintiff's customers).

17 Indeed, a closer look at the awards program reveals that Pacific's unauthorized  
18 use and disclosure of plaintiffs' information wrongfully diverts plaintiffs' customers to Pacific  
19 for long distance service, and unfairly impedes plaintiffs' ability to compete in the local  
20 exchange market. What Pacific is doing is indistinguishable from the situation of former  
21 employees who use confidential information obtained in the course of employment with their  
22 former employers, in violation of a confidentiality or non-compete agreement, to compete against  
23 them. Here, a contractual agent, Pacific, is using confidential information obtained in the course  
24 of the provision of services, in violation of the contract itself, to compete against plaintiffs in  
25 both the local and long distance markets. The harm from this conduct is continuous and  
26 irreversible. *See e.g., MAI Systems*, 1992 WL 159803 at \*17; *California Intelligence Bureau v.*

1    *Cunningham*, 83 Cal.App.2d 197, 203 (1948); *Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal Co. v. Turley*,  
2    622 F.2d 1324, 1334 (9th Cir. 1980).

3                    Further, the awards program only rewards customers who spend at least \$50 a  
4    month on their combined local and long distance bill, yet the average monthly charge for local  
5    services is just \$20-25 per line. Section II.B. Surely it is not purely by coincidence that the  
6    awards program targets and rewards only those customers who spend at least \$25 a month on  
7    long distance -- plaintiffs' most profitable customers and the heaviest users of long distance  
8    services. See Section II.B. Few, if any, customers would qualify for the awards program if  
9    Pacific only rewarded usage of services it provides.

10                  Even if Pacific does nothing else with plaintiffs' proprietary databases than  
11    extract the total monthly long distance charges as part of the "lump sum" to determine which  
12    customers qualify for the awards program, it will have gained extremely valuable information.<sup>5</sup>  
13    Pacific will have a list of who the most profitable long distance customers are among all  
14    plaintiffs' customers. Section II.B.; *Mannella Dec.*, ¶¶ 15-16. Thus, by essentially stealing  
15    plaintiffs' information, Pacific will not incur the significant costs associated with targeting and  
16    marketing to customers who may be heavy users of long distance. Section II.D. The benefit to  
17    Pacific is two-fold. First, Pacific has immediate access to the list of the best long distance  
18    customers, and that list is growing each day as plaintiffs' customers enroll in the awards  
19    program. Second, Pacific saves costs plaintiffs must incur to target customers (Section II.D.),

20

---

21                  In addition to the ongoing harms occurring from Pacific's admitted conduct, Pacific  
22    threatens plaintiffs with further harm. The releases Pacific requires customers to sign to  
23    participate in the program are broad and wide-ranging. See 5/7 *Bisazza Dec.*, Exs. 1 & 2. While  
24    Pacific professes that it is only using "lump sum" information, which includes one element of  
25    plaintiffs' proprietary information for the awards program, the releases purport to permit Pacific  
26    Bell to share *all* aspects of plaintiffs' proprietary information with PB Extras, which may then  
27    share such information with any Pacific affiliate (including PB Com) or Award Partner. 5/7  
28    *Bisazza Dec.*, ¶ 10; *Arnett Dec.*, ¶¶ 28-29.

26

1 which gives Pacific an advantageous cost position relative to plaintiffs. If not enjoined, Pacific  
2 will use or continue to use this cost savings for pricing or promotional strategies to compete  
3 unfairly with plaintiffs for long distance customers. Viewed in the competitive context, in which  
4 the parties compete for a finite number of customers, Pacific's benefit is achieved directly at  
5 plaintiffs' expense.

6 **b) Plaintiffs' loss of control over their valuable**  
7 **assets**

8 Pacific states that it is using plaintiffs' proprietary information, specifically, total  
9 monthly long distance charges, to offer a loyalty marketing program and to reward customers for  
10 staying with Pacific. Yet the billing information it is using is both proprietary, Section II.C., and  
11 an important corporate asset in the form of valuable competitive information. Section II.D.  
12 Pacific's disclosure and use of plaintiffs' proprietary information creates irreversible harm,  
13 because once disclosed or used, its competitive value evaporates. "Once information loses its  
14 confidentiality, there is no amount of money or effort that will make that information  
15 confidential again." *Peripheral Devices Corp., II. v. Ververs*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11389, \*27  
16 (N.D. Ill. 1995). The loss of plaintiffs' investment is itself irreparable harm. *See, e.g., Imi-Tech*  
17 *Corp. v. Gagliani*, 691 F. Supp. 214, 230 (S.D. Cal. 1986) (granting preliminary injunction to  
18 prevent former employee from disclosing or using plaintiff's trade secrets; "irreparable injury  
19 is . . . shown by the evidence of plaintiff's time and money in the development of the trade  
20 secrets . . . since harm to plaintiff's competitive position lacks any adequate remedy at law");  
21 *U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Origin Medsystems, Inc.*, 27 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1526, 1531 (N.D. Cal.), *aff'd*, 16  
22 F.3d 420 (Fed. Cir. 1993) ("Plaintiff has invested significant time and money developing its trade  
23 secret, and defendant has already begun to divert customers from plaintiff with its product  
24 derived from stolen proprietary information").

25 By its actions, Pacific has also deprived plaintiffs of their exclusive right to  
26 control their own proprietary information. Plaintiffs have devoted substantial resources, in the

1 millions of dollars, to compile and format usage and billing information on a customer account  
2 basis, which results in the proprietary information Pacific receives under the Billing Agreements.  
3 Section II.D. When someone has invested considerable time, effort, and expense to create  
4 something, much of the resulting economic value of the investment lies in the right to  
5 exclusively control that investment. *See Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co.*, 433  
6 U.S. 562, 575-77 (1977) (news broadcaster liable for damages to performer for depriving  
7 performer of economic value of performance); *White v. Samsung Electronics America*, 971 F.2d  
8 1395, 1399 (9th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, 508 US 951 (1993) (the law protects a celebrity's sole  
9 right to exploit value of being a celebrity); *see also Processed Plastic Co. v. Warner*  
10 *Communications, Inc.*, 675 F.2d 852, 858 (7th Cir. 1982); *Power Test Petroleum Distributors v.*  
11 *Calcu Gas*, 754 F.2d 91 (2d Cir. 1985). By simply taking plaintiffs' information, Pacific has  
12 deprived plaintiffs of deciding whether, and under what terms and conditions, they would sell  
13 their proprietary information -- or any element of it -- to Pacific for Pacific's own use. That loss  
14 of control in and of itself constitutes irreparable harm. *See MAI Systems*, 1992 WL 159803 at  
15 \*17; *U.S. Surgical Corp.*, 27 U.S.P.Q. 2d at 1531; *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Formula Int'l, Inc.*,  
16 725 F.2d 521, 526 (9th Cir. 1984); *Trans Pacific Ins. Co. v. Trans-Pacific Ins. Co.*, 739 F. Supp.  
17 240, 247 (E.D. Pa. 1990).

18           Moreover, Pacific gains an immediate benefit, free of charge, from its conduct: it  
19 takes plaintiffs' proprietary information, which it would not have *but for* the Billing Agreements,  
20 and uses it as the basis for its loyalty marketing program. Unquestionably, plaintiffs'  
21 information is valuable to Pacific because it believes it could not compete effectively without  
22 offering awards for the entire phone bill. Section II.B. Through its misappropriation, Pacific has  
23 unjustly enriched itself at plaintiffs' expense and must be stopped. *Imi-Tech Corp.*, 691 F. Supp.  
24 at 230 (without an injunction, defendants would be improperly permitted "to reap the benefits of  
25 using the trade secrets"); *see also Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir.  
26

1 1989) *cert. denied*, 493 US 853 (1989) (applying California law) (“a misappropriator of trade  
2 secrets has no authorization or right to continue to reap the benefits of its wrongful acts”).

3                   **2. The Immediate and Irreparable Injury From Pacific’s**  
4                   **False Advertising**

5                   Pacific’s false and misleading advertising campaign implementing its awards  
6 program also causes immediate and irreparable injury to plaintiffs. Where a defendant makes  
7 such a false statement, such as Pacific’s implied endorsement of Pacific’s awards program by  
8 plaintiffs, irreparable injury is *presumed*. *U-haul Int’l, Inc. v. Jartran, Inc.*, 522 F. Supp. 1238,  
9 1247 (D. Ariz. 1981), *aff’d*, 681 F.2d 1159 (9th Cir. 1982). “Irreparable injury for the purpose of  
10 injunctive relief would be present for the very reason that in an open market it is impossible to  
11 measure the exact amount of the competitor’s damages.” *Id.* (quoting *Johnson & Johnson v.*  
12 *Carter-Wallace, Inc.*, 631 F.2d 186, 192 (2d Cir. 1980)); *see also Harper House, Inc. v. Thomas*  
13 *Nelson, Inc.*, 889 F.2d 197, 210 (9th Cir. 1989). Pacific has engaged in false advertising, as  
14 described more fully below in Section III.C.4., plaintiffs, therefore, are entitled to a preliminary  
15 injunction. *Valu Engineering, Inc. v. Nolu Plastics, Inc.*, 732 F. Supp. 1024, 1025-26 (N.D. Cal.  
16 1990).<sup>6</sup>

17                   Notwithstanding the presumption of harm, irreparable harm to plaintiffs’  
18 reputations and goodwill *is* immediate. Plaintiffs’ customers are signing up for the program  
19 now, based on an advertising campaign that misleads them to believe they can earn points based  
20 on long distance usage simply by signing a “release.” When plaintiffs’ customers find out that  
21 they cannot earn such points, because the current program violates the law, they will attribute  
22 Pacific’s unlawful and deceptive practices to plaintiffs. Plaintiffs’ reputations and goodwill will  
23 be irreversibly tarnished. *Apple Computer*, 725 F.2d at 526; *Trans Pacific*, 739 F. Supp. at 247.

---

24                   <sup>6</sup> See also *Apple Computer*, 725 F.2d at 526 (trademark case); *LeSportsac, Inc. v. Kmart*  
25 *Corp.*, 754 F.2d 71, 79 (2d Cir. 1985) (trade dress case); *Trans Pacific*, 739 F. Supp. at 247;  
26 *McNeilab, Inc. v. American Home Prods. Corp.*, 501 F. Supp. 517, 540 (S.D.N.Y. 1980).

1 Pacific's conduct must be enjoined, as there is no adequate monetary remedy that could fully  
2 compensate plaintiffs for the injury that is occurring.

3 **C. Plaintiffs Will Prevail On the Merits**

4 **1. Pacific Bell Has Already Breached The Billing**  
5 **Agreements**

6 Plaintiffs provide Pacific Bell with proprietary information about *plaintiffs'*  
7 customers' long distance usage, including total monthly long distance charges, so that Pacific  
8 Bell can perform its contractual bill rendering and collection functions, and for no other reason.  
9 Section II.C. The Billing Agreements prohibit Pacific Bell from using plaintiffs' proprietary  
10 billing information for any purpose other than those specified in the contracts. *Id.* The contracts  
11 do not provide for Pacific's use of plaintiffs' data for Pacific's own marketing efforts or  
12 competitive strategy, or for disclosure within the Pacific family at large, and no plaintiff has  
13 consented to such use or disclosure. *Id.*

14 Pacific does not dispute this. *See* Opp. TRO Brief. Indeed, Pacific *admits that it*  
15 *is already using plaintiffs' proprietary information* -- total long distance monthly charges -- to  
16 calculate points for the awards program. Section II.B. As soon as customers sign up for the  
17 program (and they already have, since Pacific admits the program has begun), Pacific uses  
18 plaintiffs' proprietary information to give the customers credit for their long distance usage.  
19 Section II.B. Thus, it is undisputed that Pacific has breached the Billing Agreements, for its  
20 awards program is simply not a billing or collections service.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, this breach is ongoing.  
21 As each new customer signs up, more of plaintiffs' proprietary information is disclosed, and  
22 continues to be disclosed each and every month that customer remains in the awards program.

23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 <sup>7</sup> Conspicuously absent from Pacific's opposition to the TRO was any assurance that it  
25 would not use or disclose other elements of plaintiffs' proprietary compilation, beyond the  
26 monthly long distance usage information. If Pacific had no such intentions, it would just say so.



1 Pacific has argued that the addition of *other* service charges to plaintiffs' total  
2 monthly long distance charges to get to a "lump sum" somehow transforms plaintiffs' proprietary  
3 information into Pacific's own unrestricted information. *See* Opp. TRO Brief. But the  
4 intermingling of non-proprietary information with plaintiffs' proprietary information does not  
5 give Pacific any possessory interest in plaintiffs' information, nor does it render plaintiffs'  
6 information non-confidential. *Peripheral Devices Corp., II*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11389 at  
7 \*26-27 (where defendant intermingled misappropriated confidential information with non-  
8 confidential information on database, entire database was confidential and use of database was  
9 preliminarily enjoined).

10 Nor can customers release plaintiffs' interest in plaintiffs' proprietary billing  
11 databases. In the format in which Pacific receives customer long distance information, including  
12 total monthly long distance charges, the information is proprietary to plaintiffs. Section II.C.  
13 Only plaintiffs can authorize its use or disclosure for purposes other than those set forth in the  
14 Billing Agreements, and they have not done so. Pacific agreed to this requirement by entering  
15 into the Billing Agreements. Thus, the customer is not authorized to "release" any aspect of the  
16 information which plaintiffs have compiled, formatted, and transmitted to Pacific Bell for  
17 purposes of providing the customer with a consolidated bill. Section II.C.<sup>8</sup>

18 Pacific cannot avoid the necessary and inescapable conclusion: because it is using  
19 the total monthly long distance charges obtained from plaintiffs to calculate awards, and not for  
20 billing, Pacific is engaged in an ongoing breach of its contracts. In view of Pacific's past and  
21

22 <sup>8</sup> Pacific, however, is free to gather customer billing information and total monthly long  
23 distance charges without misappropriating plaintiffs' proprietary information. For example,  
24 Pacific could conduct customer surveys requesting this information, or could ask customers to  
25 send in their actual, printed bills. The Billing Agreements do not preclude Pacific from investing  
26 its own resources to "independently develop[], produce[], or generate[]" information about  
customers' long distance usage. *See e.g.*, 5/7 Banco Dec., Ex. 1, ¶ 4(D). That is what Pacific  
should be required to do.